

### United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/714,110	11/14/2003	Clemens Jung	IT20030039	IT20030039 1927	
173	7590 06/27/2005		EXAMINER		
	OL PATENTS COMPA	EL ARINI, ZEINAB			
500 RENAISSANCE DRIVE - SUITE 102 ST. JOSEPH. MI 49085			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•	•		1746		

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No	•	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/714,110		JUNG ET AL.					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
_		Zeinab E. EL-A	ini	1746					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status	•								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on								
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ TI	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	<u></u>								
Application Papers									
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.									
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119									
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachmen	t(s)								
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) [	Interview Summary						
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	5) 5 6) C	1	te atent Application (PTO	D-152)				

10/714,110

**Art Unit: 1746** 

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 2, "the turbidity", "the rinsing", "the course", and "the program" are all without proper antecedent basis. At line 5, "the current", "the inlet", and at line 6, "the fresh water" are all without proper antecedent basis. At line 5, "and/ or" is indefinite term. Claims 1-11

10/714,110

Art Unit: 1746

having similar and a lot of 112, second paragraph rejections, therefore the claims should be reviewed and revised to comply with 35 U.S.C. second paragraph.

3. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

# **Double Patenting**

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA

10/714,110

Art Unit: 1746

1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of copending Application No. 10/713,305. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the process as claimed in both applications is functionally equivalent.

10/714,110

Art Unit: 1746

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Claims 1-5 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7-8 of copending Application No. 10/713,304. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the process as claimed in both applications is functionally equivalent.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10/714,110

Art Unit: 1746

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bashark (3,888,269).

Bashark discloses control system for dishwasher. The reference discloses that in Patent No. 3,279,481, a turbidity sensor is used to determine the turbidity of the rinse water. See col. 1, lines 60-67. The reference discloses sensing the turbidity of the dish treating liquid after the pump has been operating for a selecting period of

10/714,110

Art Unit: 1746

time such as after one minute of the first rinse period. See col. 3, lines 3-20, and lines 49-68, and col. 4, lines 1-7, 36-46.

Bashark does not teach the process as claimed.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the process taught by Bashark to obtain the claimed process, because the process as claimed is functionally equivalent to the Bashark process. This is also because the process as claimed cannot be understood, and it can read on a method of operating a dishwasher comprises measuring the turbidity of the rinsing liquid and establishing an operating program as a function of the turbidity of the rinsing liquid.

10/714,110

**Art Unit: 1746** 

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeinab E. EL-Arini whose telephone number is (571) 272-1301. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

10/714,110

**Art Unit: 1746** 

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zeinab E. EL-Arini Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746

ZEE 06/23/05